IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JUDITH P. HOLST, No. 4:18-CV-02182

Plaintiff, (Judge Brann)

v. (Magistrate Judge Carlson)

ANDREW SAUL,¹
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

ORDER

OCTOBER 23, 2019

Judith P. Holst filed this action seeking review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security ("Commissioner") denying Holst's claim for social security disability benefits and supplemental security income.² On September 10, 2019, Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court vacate the Commissioner's decision, remand this matter for further proceedings, and close this case.³ No timely objections were filed to this Report and Recommendation.

¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Andrew Saul, as the successor officer to Nancy Berryhill, Acting Commissioner of Social Security, is automatically substituted as Defendant in this action.

² Doc. 1.

³ Doc. 14.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.⁴ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁵ Upon review of the record, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Carlson's conclusion that the Commissioner's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. Consequently, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson's Report and Recommendation
 (Doc. 14) is ADOPTED;
- The Commissioner's decision is VACATED, and this matter is
 REMANDED for further proceedings;
- 3. Final Judgment is entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
- 4. The Clerk of Court is direct to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

<u>s/Matthew W. Brann</u>Matthew W. BrannUnited States District Judge

2

⁴ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.